DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 469 SP 036 244

AUTHOR Kapel, David E.; And Others
TITLE School Choice: Education's Trickle Down Theory for Urban Students Attending Private Schools? Study II.
PUB DATE Aug 95
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Admission Criteria; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; National Surveys; Parent Participation; *Private Schools; Public Schools; *School Choice; School Demography; Tuition; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This study investigated possible effects of school choice programs by surveying 200 private schools in large urban areas. The survey instrument requested information on school demography, possible effects of participation in a Choice program, costs, selection of students participating in Choice, and climate and parental involvement. Analysis of responses from 54 schools from all areas of the country indicated: that private schools could accommodate no more than 1.2 percent of total urban enrollments; that 70 percent of schools surveyed expected to expand their student population without Choice students; that only 56.6 percent of respondents expected to expand the availability of classrooms; that 10 schools stated they would participate in a Choice program whereas 4 stated they would not and 38 were not sure; that most respondents felt parents of Choice students should make up the difference between Choice funds and tuition costs; that schools would apply the same admission criteria for Choice students as for other students; that only 6 schools said they would not exclude any students; and that schools would expect parents of Choice students to be actively involved in the schools. The study concluded that private schools have limited space for students under a Choice program, would probably prefer full tuition students, and would probably reject special needs students. Results of this study are compared to a similar one surveying public school districts adjacent to or near large urban districts. A third study focusing on religious schools exclusively is planned. Tables detail the study's findings. (Contains 29 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 387 469

SCHOOL CHOICE: EDUCATION'S TRICKLE DOWN THEORY FOR URBAN STUDENTS ATTENDING PRIVATE SCHOOLS?

Study II

David E. Kapel
Christy L. Faison
John V. Gallagher

Rowan College of New Jersey

August, 1995

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Kapel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SB362 44

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Although Presidents Reagan and Bush no longer have the bully pulpit to function as advocates for School Choice, Choice still appears to be a state and national issue (Miller, 1992, Uchitelle, 1993). At the state level, the Governor of Ohio, George V. Vornovich signed a bill that allowed the institution of a pilot voucher program (Glassman, 1995). Governors Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania and Christie Whitman of New Jersey have both been (are) strong advocates of School Choice (Perelman, 1995). In fact, a School Choice Bill was included in the Pennsylvania budget proposal for fiscal 1996 and was narrowly defeated in the legislature (Tarka, 1995). Governor Whitman was not able to get a state legislator to sponsor a School Choice Bill, even though the Mayor of Jersey City and others were strong proponents of such a bill. Still School Choice has generated strong feelings at the state level (The Philadelphia Inquirer, 1995; Cambria, 1995).

At the non-governmental national level, there is strong debate (pro and con) over School Choice plans. As stated in our earlier study (Kapel, Faison, and Gallagher, 1995), it is not the intent of the authors to take a position on School Choice; others have written extensively on both sides of the issue for many years. The reader might wish to consult the following to get an indepth background on different positions on School Choice: Clune and Witte, Volume 1 and 2, 1990; Chubb and Moe, 1990; Finn, 1994; Friedman, 1962; Henig, 1994; Kearns and Doyle, 1991; Kirkpatrick, 1990; Liberman, 1989; Lytle, 1975; McGroarty, 1994; Pearson, 1993; Scovronick and Jezierny, 1995; Smith, 1994; Smith and Meier, 1995; Strate and Wilson, 1993; Young and Clinchy, 1992.

Procedures

This study is the logical extension of the Kapel, Faison, Gallagher (1995) research that looked at internal inter-district School Choice. The present study focused on private (religious, non-religious) K-12 schools that could be possible recipients of students funded by the state under external School Choice legislation.[1] A membership list was obtained from the National Association of Independent Schools and, from that list, two-hundred private schools located in large urban areas from all regions of the country were randomly selected. Urban areas such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Dallas, St. Louis, Omaha, Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles, Seattle, Minneapolis, Baltimore, Louisville, Houston, District of Columbia, Denver, and Miami were included in the study.

The survey instrument used in the Kapel, Faison, and Gallagher study (1995) was altered to be appropriate for private schools. The instruments were sent directly to the headmasters/principals of such schools during the Spring of 1995, with a cut-off date of May 30, 1995. The instrument included the following information: demographic - i.e. size of school, available classroom capacity, increase/decrease in student population, expansion plans; effect of Choice - i.e. participation in a Choice program, areas that might be affected by participation in Choice; costs - i.e. school tuition, funding of Choice; selection of students participating in Choice - i.e. criteria for selection, exclusion criteria;

[1]External School Choice programs provide funding for students to attend non-Public K-12 schools. Internal programs restrict funding to only public schools-whether intra-or inter-school system Choice (Martin, 1991; Martin and Burke, 1990).

climate and parental involvement - i.e. how Choice students might affect the school, reactions of "native" students and their parents to Choice students, and the possible role of Choice parents in the private school.

Findings

Fifty-four (54) schools responded to the survey that was to be filled out anonymously; this number equates to 27% of the two-hundred that were sent out. All areas of the country were represented in the fifty-four; percentage of response ranged from 40% from the Midwest to 15% from the New England section of the country.

As was stated previously, religious and non-religious affiliated private schools were included in the survey. The majority of respondents, N=41 or 76%, were not affiliated with a religious organization. Thirteen (13), or 24% of the respondents, were part of a religious organization: three (3) were Roman Catholic, six (6) were Episcopal, three (3) were of the Society of Friends, and one (1) was Presbyterian.

Although only 27% of the private schools surveyed responded, the number of students served by these schools was 27,680 (Table 1). The size of the school population by grade level (Pre-school/Elementary, Middle School/Junior High, Senior High School) ranged from 27 to 778; the total population ranged from 84 to 1,200. The discrepancy of the range by grade level compared to total is due to the vast majority of

respondents who served children from grades K-12. (Also note that eight (8) schools did not provide enrollment data.)

Classroom utilization by grade levels ranged from a low of 25% capacity (Pre-school/Elementary) to 175% of capacity (also Pre-school/Elementary). The mean capacity of classroom space being used for the respondents in this study was 92.3% (Table 1). Since 27,680 represented 92.3% utilization of the schools' capacity in this study, the total student population (100%) that can be accommodated by the schools in this study is 29,989, or put another way, the respondents could only accept 2,309 additional students in their schools before reaching capacity.

The urban districts previously listed (New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Atlanta, etc.) have a total student population of 3,341,750. The respondents could only accommodate 2,309 new students, or 00.07% of the urban school population. Even if the private school number were adjusted to reflect the national ratio of public/private school enrollments (National Center for Education Statistics, 1993), the new adjusted number of 40,626 would represent only 1.2% of the urban enrollments.

The private school population is expanding with thirty-three (33) of the respondents indicating that their school population was presently increasing, fourteen (14) indicated they did not see any expansion, and two (2) schools are currently experiencing a decrease. Seventeen (17) of the schools expect expansion over the next five years at

the pre-school and elementary level, nineteen (19) at the junior high/middle school level, and twenty-one (21) at the senior high level. It is interesting that five (5) schools predict that, in the next five years, their school population will decrease. Thus, 70.2% of the private schools report that they will expand their student population (without Choice students). This expansion will obviously create problems for Choice students if and when they were to enroll in these private schools under a Choice Program (Table 1).

Only 56.6% (N=30) of the schools responding expect to expand the availability of classrooms. This will put further constraints on the availability of space for Choice students (Table 1). Of the thirty (30) expecting to expand their classrooms, twenty-two (22) will build new facilities, twenty-two (22) will expand present facilities, four (4) will lease or rent space and two (2) will increase class size. Twenty-three (23) do not expect to expand classrooms (Table 1).

If, given the option, ten (10) of the respondents stated that they would participate in a Choice program, four (4) stated they would not, and thirty-eight (38) were not sure. Thus, the vast majority of respondents (73%) would not make a commitment at this time (Table 2). Whether or not schools can presently accommodate Choice students was a question that was asked of the respondents. Twenty-eight (28) indicated yes they could, twenty-two (22) indicated they could not, and four (4) were not sure. Of the twenty-two (22) who could not accommodate Choice students, thirteen (13) indicated that they could not because they had already reached capacity. Thus it would appear that, although 52%

of the respondents said they could accommodate Choice students, the data reported above would indicate that these numbers would be quite small. This can be seen further in the level at which an average number of Choice students could be accommodated (refer to Table 2). Although the ranges of accommodation were from 0 to 100, the estimated mean number of Choice students per level was 20 at the Preschool/Elementary, 21 at the middle school/junior high, and 33 at the senior high level, for an overall mean of 24.67. Considering the expansion of the present private school population, the expansion over the next five years, and the level of school capacity that already exists, it is apparent that the number of Choice students that could be accommodated per level and the total number would be, at best, very small.

Schools that would participate in Choice would face a variety of changes (increases) in facilities, class size, etc. According to the respondents, areas that would be affected most by Choice would be the number of instructional staff (N=32) and the physical facilities (N=30). Co-curricular (N=17), transportation (N=17), and counseling (N=16) would also experience increases. Class size (N=13), the library (N=13), and the number of teacher aides (N=13) would experience increases as well. Supplies (N=11) would have to be increased too. It is interesting that the number of administrators would increase, but certainly not at the same level as other areas (Table 2).

Tuition for private schools is an important factor in the Choice program, at least in terms of the individual student funding and to what extent these funds would cover the

tuition costs. The cost per student attending one of the schools in the respondent group ranged from $1,550 at the Preschool/Elementary level to $17,900 at the Senior High level. The mean per pupil cost ranged from $6,365 at the Preschool/Elementary level to $9,150 at the Senior High level. As part of the cost factor, respondents were asked if Choice funds were less than the tuition cost, who should make up the difference. The vast majority of the respondents (45) felt that parents should make up the difference. Twenty (20) indicated the difference could be made up by the private school through financial aid scholarships and other financial sources, and ten (10) felt that the home public school district should make up the difference. Only three (3) felt the state should make up the difference and none (0) felt that the Federal Government should be involved (Table 3).

The selection of Choice students by private schools or, to put it another way, the admission into the private schools of Choice students is extremely important. Respondents were asked on what basis would they accept Choice students. The vast majority (47 or 87%) indicated that they would accept students meeting their school's criteria. Thirty-four (34 or 62.9%) indicated that school testing would be a factor in the selection of Choice students (Table 4). Only two (2) indicated they would accept students meeting state regulations. It is apparent from the responses that Choice students would be accepted only after their present school students (native) would be seated in their schools. Very few would use a lottery procedure under any condition. It would appear that religious schools would not use religion as a criteria of selection. It is also interesting to note that 48% (N=26) would select Choice students based on establishing or retaining

a diverse population. Thus race, gender, nationality, etc. could be a factor in the acceptance of Choice students (Table 4). The selection or testing criteria for students accepted into the school indicates that admissions/entrance exams, academic ability and potential are the primary factors for admission into the private school. Grades, records, transcripts, references and recommendations would also be important factors in admission. Thirteen (13) schools indicated that they would use the interview procedure as part of the criteria for admission. Nine (9) indicated that citizenship and social preparedness would be factors as well. Others are listed in Table 4. It is also interesting to note that twenty-six (26) of the private schools indicated that they would admit students based on establishing a diverse population; yet, only one (1) listed ethnic imbalance as a factor in admission.

When asked on what basis they would exclude Choice students, only six (6) said that they would <u>not</u> exclude any students regardless of criteria. The rest gave a variety of rationales. Lack of academic readiness/ability, records that indicate little chance of success, and emotional/behavioral problems would all be factors for excluding Choice students. A variety of other reasons are listed in Table 4. Although only four (4) schools indicated that they would exclude special needs students, it's noteworthy that twenty-two (22) would exclude students on the basis of emotional/behavioral problems. Thus, the nature of the special need student who would also be a Choice student could be a factor in rejection by the private school.

It is apparent that comparing the responses to the selection procedure and the reasons for excluding Choice students, that academic ability and scores on entrance examinations will be the primary factors for admission into the private schools of Choice students. What's also interesting to note is the fact that interviews, references, and recommendations are also important admission criteria. If one were to couple that with the twenty-two (22) schools that would exclude students based on emotional and behavioral problems, the interview procedure and references become important.

Bringing Choice students into a private school could possibly have an affect on both the student population as well as others connected to and/or affiliated with the private school. Respondents were asked whether Choice students would enhance their school or culture. Forty-nine (49) of the fifty-four (54) responded to this question (Table 5). Thirty-two (32) or 65% of those responding indicated that they did not know what effect Choice students would have on their school's culture or climate. Twenty-six percent indicated that Choice students would enhance school climate (N=13) and only four (4) of the forty-nine (49) indicated they would not enhance the climate. Fifty-five percent did not know whether Choice students would be disruptive to their school climate, while 40% felt that the Choice program would not be disruptive. Only two (2) said they felt it would (Table 5).

When asked how native students would react to Choice students, forty-nine (49) of the survey participants responded to the question (Table 5). Of the forty-nine (49),

twenty-five (25) or 51% felt that the students would have either a mixed or neutral attitude towards these new students. Seventeen (17 or 34.6%) felt that the students would react positively and only three (3) felt they would be negative. Forty-seven (47) respondents reacted to the issue of how native parents would feel about Choice students. Thirty-eight percent (38% or 18) felt that the parents would have a mixed or neutral attitude towards the new students, while an almost equal amount felt that the parents would have a positive attitude. Only four (4) respondents felt that the parents would be negative towards Choice students (Table 5).

As Choice students enroll in private schools, then naturally the parents of these students will become involved in such schools. The respondents were asked about potential parental involvement of Choice students in private schools. The respondents saw a variety of parent-participation activities for the parents of Choice students (Table 5). Fifty-two (52) respondents saw participation in parent-school organizations at the school level, fifty-one (51) indicated participation in parent-teacher conferences, fifty-two (52) would allow parent volunteers, forty-three (43) saw participation in home-school night activities, and forty-three (43) saw parents being candidates for their school board of their board of trustees. The results indicate that, if the Choice students do attend the private schools, then the respondents saw a variety of important activities for the parents and, most likely, would expect them to be full participants.

The above data was also broken down by region. Due to the small number of private schools responding from several of the sections of the country, there were no regional comparisons reported in this study.

In 1990-91 there were 24,690 private schools in the country, of which 20,207 were religious affiliated (8,731 were Catholic) (National Center for Education Statistics, 1994). The authors are aware that the ratio of religious affiliated schools to non-religious affiliated private schools in the United States is not reflected in either the population surveyed or the responses received, for the authors wanted to survey private schools (regardless of affiliation) that would most likely be affected by Choice legislation that would impact on urban areas.

Thus we restricted our survey to urban areas only. However, we did break out the data from the religious schools (N=13), and, even though the number was small, we found that the religious schools' responses were not significantly different from their counter-parts in this study. Some minor differences between the two groups of private schools were found: the mean enrollment of the religious schools at the high school level was higher (272 as compared to 202); average mean total enrollment of religious schools was 566 as compared to 643 for all private schools; all religious school enrollments were increasing and only 38% planned to expand available classroom space; sixty-nine (69) percent indicated that they were not sure whether they would participate in a Choice program (as compared to 73%); and the average number of Choice students that could

be accommodated by religious schools was 30 (Elementary), 28 (Middle School/Junior High) and 37 (high School) as compared to 20, 21 and 33. All other results were almost an exact duplication of the data reported in Tables 1-5.

Summary

In order for Choice programs to be successful (to allow students the option of movement under the conditions set by the Choice legislation), there must be classroom space available within the private schools. The data reported in this study indicates that there would be little space for expansion under present conditions. Even under adjusted numbers, the space available would represent only 1.2% of the enrollments in the urban school districts that were the focus of this study. Adding to the space problem is the present expansion of enrollments (prior to Choice) in the private schools: expansion to 100% capacity. Once the schools reach 100% capacity, they will be faced with adding new facilities and staff which will take considerable funds.

Which new students will the schools take? The full tuition students? The Choice students, especially if Choice legislation doesn't cover full costs? These questions can't be answered by this study, yet the reader could speculate on the answer. Another question that will need to be answered is: if the financial voucher under Choice legislation does not equal tuition, will the Choice parents have to make up the

differences? Will the "native" parents make up the difference? If it is the latter, then tuition for the "native" students would have to be revised to cover the school's expenses; a situation not particularly attractive to the "native" parents.

The respondents were quite clear as to who the private schools would accept as Choice students - those who met their specific school standards. Test results would be a major factor in the admissions process, as would past academic achievement and recommendations. Special needs students, particularly those with emotional and/or behavioral problems, need not apply for admission to the schools in this study. Given the academic achievement and the negative environments of urban students, most urban students would not be able to meet the entrance requirements.

The private schools appear to welcome the parents of Choice students, expecting them to be full participants in the schools; even expecting Choice parents to be candidates for their board of trustees/school board. However, many of the respondents felt that "native" parents and students would have mixed or neutral reactions to Choice students.

Postscript

As stated at the beginning of this paper, this study was an extension of the Kapel, Faison and Gallagher (1995) study that surveyed public school districts adjacent to or

near large urban school districts. This present study focused only on private (religious, non-religious) schools. The following is a brief description of similarities and differences found in these studies.

The mean capacities were almost identical (92.3% private, 91.99% public). More private schools than public schools indicated that they were not expanding. Those that were expanding intended to build new facilities and/or expand present ones; these were about equal in both groups. More (ratio) public schools than private schools indicated that they would not participate in Choice, although more private than public felt that they were not sure of Choice participation.

It was not surprising that the mean number of Choice students that could be accommodated by public schools was significantly higher than could be accommodated by the privates. In the first study (public), there were 27,155 available seats; in the second study (private) there were 2,309 additional seats, for a total for the two of 29,464. This number represents 0.89% of the 3,341,750 student urban population attending the school districts previously listed. Even with the adjusted private school numbers, the total available would only represent 2.03% of the urban school population. It is clear in both studies that the number of urban students who could participate in Choice programs under present facility availability is quite small. This raises the issue of whether Choice programs are indeed Choice, or are they Choice for only a few students?

Costs for educating public and private students is about the same at the elementary and middle school levels (public - $6,356, $7,144; private - $6,365, $8,091). However, there is a difference at the high school level (public - $7,874; private $9,150). There were significant differences between the two groups as to who should make up any differences. Privates didn't see a role for the state or the federal government in making up the financial loss. The publics did almost a reverse, with the state, the federal government, or the sending school district picking up the differences.

The privates relied on their school criteria and testing program for admission of Choice students, whereas the publics relied on the school criteria and state regulations for admission. The privates want to be more restrictive in admission of Choice students; they only want high achievers and are more adamant about admitting special needs children than the public districts, although the public respondents tended not to list exclusionary criteria. In other words, the privates were more outspoken against the admission of special needs students than were the publics. Both groups would consider their "native" students for admission before considering Choice students.

Both respondent groups felt generally the same way about whether Choice students and parents would enhance or become active in their respective schools, although the publics were a bit more negative. Parents of Choice students would have a greater opportunity to serve on the privates' policy boards than they would on the public boards of education. (This would be due to present residency requirements for serving

on public boards of education.)

The results of both studies raise questions about the real viability of school Choice - whether open to public only or public and private (religious, non-religious). In order for Choice programs to be viable and not benefit only those who are already sending their children to private schools, space availability, criteria for selection, sufficient funds to cover actual costs, preparation of receiving schools, students and parents for Choice students, and programs for full participation of Choice students and parents must be considered in any Choice legislation. Full participation should be the goal of such legislation - legislation that will give students real options. Students attending urban schools deserve the options available to their counterparts from middle and upper socio-economic communities.

Future Directions

The authors recognize that religious schools (Catholic, non-Catholic) make up 81.8% of the private schools in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics, 1994, Table 59, p.70) and that this study doesn't reflect the ratio of religious to non-religious schools. Therefore, the authors intend to initiate a third study that will focus on religious schools exclusively to determine their attitudes toward school Choice.

Table 1: Demographics

	Size of School Population				Percentage of Classroom Capacity Being Used		
	f Responding	Range	Total per Level	Mean	f Responding	Range %	Mean %
Pre-school/Elementary	40	40 - 450	9,667	241.68	45	25 - 175	94.5
Middle School/Jr High	43	36 - 342	6,749	156.95	42	20 - 110	91.1
Senior High School	41	27 - 778	8,322	202.98	34	30 - 110	86.5
Total	43 *	84 - 1,200	27,680	643.72	38	60 - 110	92.3

* Some districts didn't break down their school structure; these figures combine levels.

School Expansion

School Population Expanding:
Yes 33 No 14
(Two schools are experiencing a decrease)

Expanding in the next five years:

Level	*f*
Pre-school/Elementary	17
Middle School/Jr High	19
Senior High School	21

Decreasing in the next five years:

	f
Pre-school/Elementary	2
Middle School/Jr High	1
Senior High School	2

Plan to expand the availability of classrooms:
Yes 30 No 23

If expanding, how:

Building new facilities -	22
Expanding present facilities -	22
Increasing class size -	2
Leasing/renting space -	4
Reopen closed facilities -	0
Other:	0

Table 2: Effects of Choice

If optional, will your school participate in a choice program?	Yes 10	No 4	Not Sure 38
Can school accommodate choice students?	Yes 28 *	No 22 **	Not Sure 4

* Qualified "Yes" response - students must meet academic standards (N=1), must meet admission standards (N=1), only if the school can be selective (N=1)

** Why school could not participate in choice: School capacity reached (N=13); no desire to get larger (N=3), unsuitable for some students (N=1), concern about government regulations/interference (N=1), vouchers will not have sufficient impact on costs (N=1), our demand is high (N=1).

Level and Average Number of Choice Students That can be Accommodated:

Level	f Responding	Range	Estimated Mean Number of Choice Students
Pre-school/Elementary	23	0 - 95	20
Middle School/Jr High	24	5 - 60	21
Senior High School	18	10 - 100	33
Mean			24.67

Areas That Will be Affected by Choice:

Physical facilities	30	Number of Instructional Staff	32	Security Personnel	2
Co Curricular	17	Number of Administrators	9	Library	13
Counseling/Child Study Team	16	Number of Teacher Aides	13	Transportation - (Field Trips)	17
Class Size	13	In-Service Training	9	Supplies	11
				Other	3 *

* Technology personnel, playing fields, physical ed classes, computer lab stations

Table 3: Costs

A.

Present Cost Per Pupil at:	f Responding	Range	Mean Per Pupil Costs
Pre-school/Elementary	40	$ 1550-9900	$ 6,365.12
Middle School/Jr. High	42	$ 3250-12,350	$ 8,091.35
Senior High School	37	$ 5000-17,900	$ 9,150.53

B. If choice funds are less than cost, who should pay for it? (Multiple responses possible)

The Parent	45
The Home Public School District	10
Your School	20 *
The State	3
The Federal Government	0

* Financial Aid (N=10); Scholarships (N=1); other private sources (N=1)

Table 4: Selection of Choice Students

Schools Accepting Choice Students

A. Basis upon which school would accept choice students:

School's Criteria *	47	First come, first served for all students	2
State Regulations	2	Based on establishing or retaining a diverse population	26
School's Testing *	34		
Lottery only for available seats (after native students are enrolled)	2	For Religious schools only - take only students who are affiliated with the particular religious group **	0
Lottery where all students, regardless of origin, are selected at random	1	Other	0
First come, first served (after native students are enrolled)	18		

* Selection or testing criteria:

admission/entrance exam	(19)	character	(2)
academic ability/potential	(18)	ability to contribute to school's mission	(2)
transcript/records/grades	(15)	interests	(2)
references/recommendations	(14)	written application	(2)
interview	(13)	no LD/special need	(2)
citizenship/social preparedness	(9)	college-bound	(2)
standardized tests (SSAT, IQ, ERB, ISEE)	(7)	family commitment/support	(2)
avg to gifted range	(5)	writing sample	(1)
school visit	(3)	extracurricular activities	(1)
talents (athletic, artistic, academic)	(3)	ethnic balance	(1)
attitude	(3)	upper 1/3 of class	(1)

** However, two schools would admit choice students if they would accept the school's religious activities, even if the students were not of that religion.

Schools Excluding Choice Students

B. Would not exclude any student 6

Criteria used to exclude student applicants:

Lack of academic readiness/ability; records indicate little chance of success.	(24)	Poor references	(2)
Emotional/behavioral problems	(22)	Financial constraints	(2)
Low test scores	(6)	Non college bound	(1)
Inappropriate to mission of school	(5)	Drug use	(1)
Special needs student	(4)	Girls (Boys school)	(1)
Failure to meet admission criteria	(4)	Boys (Girls school)	(1)
Lack of parental support	(3)	Lack of space	(1)
Low IQ	(3)		

Table 5: Climate and Parental Involvement

Climate

A. Will school choice students enhance your school culture/climate? Yes 13 No 4 Don't Know 32

B. Will school choice be disruptive to your school culture/climate? Yes 2 No 21 Don't Know 29

C. Reaction to choice students

	Positive	Cautious	Mixed or Neutral	Negative	Don't know
"Native" Students:	17	1	25	3	3
"Native" Parents:	17	4	18	4	4

Choice Parental Involvement

A. Participation in parent/school organizations at the school level 52

B. Participation in site based management teams 6

C. Parent volunteers 52

D. Participation in parent advisory boards at the school level 31

E. Candidate for your school board/trustees 41

F. Participation in Home/School Night activities 43

G. Participation in Parent-Teacher Conferences 51

H. Participation in fund raising 2

I. Same involvement as other parents 7

8/3/95

References

Cambria,J. (1995) Education concurrence. *N.J. Voter* (League of Women Voters-New Jersey), January/February, 1995 4+.

Clune,W. and Witte,J. editors (1990). *Choice and control in American education: The theory of choice and control in education*, Volume 1, London, England: The Falmer Press.

Clune,W. and Witte,J. editors (1990). *Choice and control in American education: The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring*, Volume 2, London, England: The Falmer Press.

Chubb,J. and Moe,T. (1990). *Politics, markets, and American schools. Washington,DC: Brookings Institute.*

Finn,C. (1994). What to do about education. The schools. *Commentary*, 98(4), 30-37.

Friedman,M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Glassman,J. Education sector looks promising. *The Washington Post*, July 10, 1995.

Henig,J. (1994). *Rethinking school choice - Limits of the market metaphor.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kapel,D., Faison,C., and Gallagher,J. (1995). Inter-district school choice: A viable option or education's trickle down theory? *National Forum AERJ*, Fall, in press.

Kearns,D. and Doyle,D. (1991). *Winning the brain race: A bold plan to make our schools competitive.* San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies.

Kirkpatrick,D. (1990). *Choice in schooling.* Chicago: Loyola University Press.

Liberman,M. (1989). *Privatization and educational choice.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Lytle,R. (1975). *Liberty schools: A parent's voucher plan - A new way to handle school money.* Farmington, MA: Shuctures Publishing Co.

Martin,M. and Burke,D. (1990). What's best for children in the school of choice movement? *Educational Policy*, 4(2), 73-91.

Martin,M. (1991). Trading the known for the unknown: Warning signs in the debate over schools of choice. *Education and the Urban Society.* 23(2), 119-143.

McGroarty,D. (1994). School choice slandered. *The Public Interest*, 117 (Fall), 94-111.

Miller,J. (1992). Bush stand on school choice is seen bolder. *Education Week*, 12(1), 1+.

National Center for Education Statistics (1994). *Digest of education statistics*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, OERI.

National Center for Education Statistics (1993). *Projection of education statistics to 2003*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, OERI.

Pearson,J. (1993). *Myths of educational choice*. Westport,CT: Praeger Publishers.

Perelman,L. (1995). Real school choice, the high-teach way. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 4, D7.

Philadelphia Inquirer (1995). A poor choice (editorial). *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 14, A18.

Scovronick,N. and Jezierny,K. (1995). *Revitalizing urban schools*. Princeton, NJ: Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

Smith,K. (1994). Policy, markets, and bureaucracy: Re-examining school choice. *The Journal of Politics*, 56(2), 475-491.

Smith,K. and Meier,K. (1995). *The case against school choice*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Strate,J. and Wilson,C. (1993). Public opinion on school choice: The Detroit metropolitan area. *The Urban Review*, 25(2), 123-137.

Tarka,J. (1995). Voucher vote melodrama. *News Notes* (the Newsletter of Pennsylvania ACTE and ATE), July 3.

Uchitelle,S. (1993). *School choice: Issues and answers*. Bloomington,IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Young,T. and Clinchy,E. (1992). *Choice in public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.